Memo on Boxley reports Harold Weisberg 12/7/ 68

Just before midnight Thursday I was given what is said to be the Perrin file and read it hastily, midst much conversation and confusion. Last night I was given a few of his other memosand the transcript of a phone conversation with "M". I make brief comment on a few of these.

The 5-17-68 memo "NSRP" quotes one "DR-I", who I take to be one of the Dallas researchers, to the effect that "the 'true head' of the National States Rights Party' was a certain RETIRED ADMIRAL JOHN CROMMELIN". The admiral is a well-known fascist, a violent anti-Semite, and there can be no connection between the appearance of his name in the "Thunderbelt" and his membership in or leadership of the NSRP. That he had not there been "designated as head of the NSRP" is not sinister but factual. The officers are publicly known and identified. If he were head it would be public. This small party does hold State conventions and meetings, does run candidates for public office, etc.

Generally what is lacking here is lacking everywhere (aside from fact). That is any appraisal whatsoever of the dependability of the source. Any official receiving what is presented as information from one he trusts is entitled to believe that, in the absence of indication to the contrary, only what is responsible is being reported, that the reporter is satisfied about the dependability of his source. The fact is that the quoted sources are, from reading of the reports alone, neither dependable nor impartial. Even where there was derrogatory information available about key sources, it was withheld from the memos, as I will cite in the Kiruschevsky case. In some cases, the contents of these reports is an obvious feedback of what Jim Garrison had been saying and was then in the news, as with the sewers,, where an entirely unevaluated source in the 3-19-68 memo is quoted with a straight face as having heard "Bradley propose the use of the storm drain system as a location for the prospective assassination of President Kennedy and had suggested a manhole escape route from the system."

Nowhere in this memo, headed "Supplement to BILL TURNER'S memorandum of EDGAR EUGENE BRADLEY" is there any indication that the Aydlette's were sworn enemies of Bradley and were suing him, or vice versa. This is in the files, was well known in California. I personally supplied this information, in some detail, having been given it for this purpose by Art Kevin. Mrs. A is "certain" she saw Gordon Novel visit Clint Wheat with Loran Hall - at precisely the time there was radio and printed news attention to these names in her area (some of it then coming from my own intensive appearances there). There is much of this, and any is too much.

The July 1, 1968 memo inaccurately entitled BARBARA REID interview", actually a joint interview with her ofSam Brandenberg and "Chris" Christian (and I suggest

One of the consequences of this "error" could be its misfiling) is too incomplete from what Barbara has independently told me of this interview. Before knowing of this memorandum of it, I had asked her to write a complete account for Sciambra.

The March 19, 1968 memo is entitled "miscellaneous notes for future reference". This is the kind of memorandum that is often essential, and it is difficulty in them to be inclusive and complete. However, I suggest that calling the slip of paper Oswald had in his pocket when he was arrested as his "name list" is neither accurate nor descriptive. It is a paper he prepared that would immediately tell any officer seeing it he had Russian connections. To cite a "slip" in referring to Oswald as "Harvey Lee Oswald" as "similar to that made in Dallas by H.L. Hunt" is both prejudicial and meaningless. It is designed to suggest that Hunt is involved, of which there is here or elsewhere no evidence. It is also the "slip" made by Clay Shaw, which is more relevant and is not even cited. This same memo concludes by pointing out that Secret Service Agent Vial spells his name like (and here again the phrasing is, I think, erroneous "JACK RUBY's Dallas lawyer friend Robert G. Vial." I doubt the suggestion would have been made had both been named Smith. I also doubt Vial was Ruby's lawyer in Dallas.

The phone conversation is worth attention there is here no time for. It is an excellent example of a designed deception, an exciting pretense of evidence that does not exist, of evidence in hand that is not, of deep meaning where there is none, of fact that is not. It is the kind of lying that fixes and misinforms a busy official's mind. The means by which he establishes an "intelligence net" are a means by which the selection of any names at random could with as much validity establish the existence of such a "net". (This conversation was recorded 5-26-67.) There is not even reasonable suspicion that this could be true, as a careful reading shows, but a listening likely would not, particularly with the emphasis of the human voice. Who could possibly me believe that the Gehlen apparatus would first find an agent to the United States and then train him, of the other improbables required to consider this young man an "agent". He would be trained before he left, thereby assuring those for whom he worked that he was trained and increasing his chances of survival and performance of assigned duties. Everything said of this man, who becomes an agent on presumption alone and in the absence of any reasonable basis for the presumption, can be said of almost anyone. About the same things can be said for his connection with Shaw as an agent. Where there is in this conversation clear inference of homosexual involvement (page 6) that is ignored, the fiction of Gehlen connection obviously being more exciting to the intended audience. He knows so little of the Gehlen organization he is not even certain of its name. He says it was taken over by the CIA. Where, then, is there any need to send an unskilled mercenary of an "agent" from Germany to Texas to do nothing? Incidentally, where it is necessary to seem to provide a basis for connection, it is manufactured. The Gehlen organization is said "of course", to be "strongest in Mexico, South America and Spain", which is very convenient, if not supported. Gehlen "was the

[redacted]ficer.

Youngblood is said to be certain of the date "because it was just prior to the last mobile home show held in the Dallas City Auditorium September 26-30, 1962." Now this is the kind of incident by which it is possible to fix recollections. What is lacking is authentication of the date. If there is no reason to presume it wrong, that his recollection is in error, there likewise is none to assume him infallible or his recollection unflawed. It should have been checked and authenticated. More, the date on which [redacted] is said then to have been in Dallas is at a time when there seems to be no evidence she was and pretty strong evidence she was in New Orleans or Maine, my recollection is unclear. It was September 1962, a month after Perrin's 8-28-62 death.

At the bottom of page 3 is the beginning of a discussion of Eddie Brawner. He is refferred tl in a quotation from the Commission material (26H633 as "Edward Brannaur", to which Bexley has appended "Sic". Thereafter he goes into a big thing about the FBI "finally centers upon RONALD EDWARD BROWDER then in Atlanta, Georgia".

There is no indication here of any search for any unpublished material on Browder, and there are now indexes available. There is no indication any of us working in these files were asked if we had any information. I can not be certain there is such, but it is my recollection there is and I have it. This is not nearly as significant as what I yesterday learned from Joel Palmer, that Bexley had and withheld from the memo and the files other information and documentation he had. It is not consistent with what he here says. Brawner was also known as or was addressed as "BRANNER". He gave Bexley a telegram addressed to him under that name. Palmer showed it to me and Bud Fensterwald and I read it. It was a request that he join the Bay of Pigs perparations and activities. Although there was the inference (I believe Palmer made it specific), that this telegram originated in Miami, the interbal evidence is that it originated in Dallas and was sent to a Dallas address. With the interesting part of Nancy's story that her husband had been offered a job to take a boat to Cuba, smuggled arms in and get a big price, it is simply incredible that this significant evidence was omitted by accident, particular because of the big deal Bexley made of the FBI switching of names. I checked with Lyon today and there is no copy of this telegram in the files. Bexley had it, withheld it, gave a copy apparently Xeroxed on the office machine to Palmer, and no one else knew of it (I also checked with Sciambra). It seems to me that certain inferences are here unescapable: he is holding out, especially what is inconsistent with what he is contriving, and all of this work is thereby suspect. I will return to this especially in discussing my long session yesterday afternoon with Palmer.

This is particularly poisoneus in the light of this language: "There is no nothing to indicate that the FBI ever called on EDDIE BRANNER (or YOUNGBLOOD either, for that matter) in connection with NANCY's statements and [redacted]

testimony".

This telegram indicates it had the same motive as Bexley, [redacted] eliminating what was inconsistent with its preconception. The telegram supports inferences of Cuban involvements. Neither the FBI nor Bexley find this congenial.

Lacking here is any reason for the Dallas approach to the Perrins or any consideration that Nancy might, indeed be psycho or a liar (other than on a selective basis, the selection by Bexley).

There are also internal inconsistencies bordering on deception. There is much that is without reason or reason being sought. Some of the ignored contradictions bring into question the dependability of the witnesses on which what I believe to be a contrivance is based.

The Brawners, from whom the telegram that is denied the files was obtained, place the date Nancy was in Dallas in 1964. As cited above, Youngblood (and here his wife), place the date in 1962 and seem firm about it. They also have a small daughter with Nancy, as no one else does. "Nor could they explain to their own satisfaction why they would have known NANCY and BOB only as Starr while YOUNGBLOOD knew them as Starr-corrected-to - PERRIN".

One obvious possibility that is destructive to the prefabrication is that this Starr and Perrin are not the same (particularly with the fourteen year difference in ages that becomes apparent).

The cited "anomolys" are not exhausted (p.4) Some of the people knew the pair as Starr, others as Perrin. The clear possibility that this all derives from Nancy's falsehoods is avoided because, as I learned from Joel Palmer, he and Bexley are determined not to acknowledge that she is a liar. What kind of people were going to enter into a big deal with a pair whose names they could not even be sure of?

When this comment, "It was all PERRIN could do to write a one-page letter" is not bracketed with the quotation from Nancy's testimony it follows, to the effect that he was a writer, as she was, without emphasizing the undependability of anything coming from her, the motive is suspect.

Next we have Brawner attending "meetings" with the Perrin's. Bexley says "the possibility...is good". Yet at the bottom of this page, he acknowledges that Brawner "was unable to pinpoint the house". From his report, that seems to be a considerable understatement, for he seems not to have been able to even guess the street on which it was. This is precisely as it was with Nancy in her testimony. Brawner was taken "on a field reconnaisance". Penn Jones could not come close to any location from Nancy's description when I asked him.

Brawner is said to have backed out of whatever unspecified thing was the subject of his attendance at these "meetings" because of a tale that the Colonel had buttons by which he made a phone-bell ring in another room. Palmer's explanation of this is to give him an excuse for conferring with confederates in another room.

If there was any need for such conference, it is not suggested in the memo, which offers cops and robbers but nothing else, no explanation at all, or by Palmer, of whom I sought it.

The field reconnaissance bit is concluded with the statement that "residents of the area said that a large house had been demolished three or four years previously", which would indicate that Bexley knew the address, which he does not give. It also indicates he could have taken Brawner there, which he does not say, and that Brawner could not identify the address. However, this in the memo is under the date October 10, 1968 at the earliest, when , at 3 p.m., the Brawners were "contacted". Yet it was months before that that Bexley told me about this . He was then quite positive that he had located precisely the right house.

From this it would seem that Bexley had the address of the house and his trusted informants could not identify the neighborhood or surroundings, despite his saying they had attended "meetings" there, and he withheld this intelligence from his memorandum, or he fabricated the knowledge that he did have the location. Here also there is seeming significance in his holding out on me, even asking me, as he did a month ago, to stay off this aspect because it was so "tender" when he knew I had people who had spoken to Nancy and who would go back to her, and when I had asked identification pictures of him to show to her, as she had agreed. It is difficult to regard the formulations, the omissions, the blanks in this Brawner-Youngblood part of his report as innocence or simple incompetence. To me it amounts to wilfull misrepresentation to Jim, who would be acting on the basis of his trust in Bexley and the dependability of his reports. Here also there is lacking what is always missing, his appraisal of the reliability of the witnesses. Instead he exudes confidence while carefully endorsing not endorsing his sources, almost as though laying the foundation for escaping responsibility when the entire thing blew apart by saying, "all I do is report, nothing else". Generally and specifically this is not true. He knows his reports have control over Jim's thinking and he knows he is responsible for pointing out the weaknesses of his information and his witnesses.

This avoidance of the reliability of the witnesses becomes more obviously deliberate in the New Orleans part, which then follows (beginning at the top of page 6). It begins with accurate quotation from Nancy's testimony, that on leaving Dallas in the fall of 1961 they lived "part of the time down in one of the Sisters' places, down in the French Quarter on St. Phillip St. And then 1713 Calhoun...and various other places which I cannot remember, sir." The only error I can recall from this quotation, without the testimony in front of me, is the position of the apostrophe, and my recollection can be in error.

From this Bexley, with authoritativeness, quotes New Orleans Public Service Records proving Robert Perrin lived on the third floor of 637 St. Phillip Street

is too incomplete

At an unspecified time prior to March 9, 1962, and left owing a bill of $12.42 which (which?) was turned over to the retail Credit Bureau on April 13, 1962, after attempts to collect it at 637 St. Phillip St were unsuccessful on March 9-10 and April 13, 1962."

This is impressively specific to the eye of the busy reader, such as Jim, but strangely unspecific on analysis. It seems unlikely that the utility has no record showing when service began, and it is important to know this date because it might indicate when the Ferrie's reached New Orleans and it would certainly indicate whether there is another void in their New Orleans careers.

Intent to dissemble becomes more clear to me with the following paragraph:

"The 1962 and 1964 city directories for New Orleans disclose occupants of 637 St. Phillip Street, where NANCY and Bob resided upon arrival here from Dallas (emphasis added), for there is no indication this is where they lived "on arrival from Dallas and reason to suspect it is not), to have been JAMES EVOLA (owner, no occupation); Walter A. Hammond (plumber); and FRANK CONGEMI (U.S. Internal Revenue Service officer).

It would be comforting to here have a report of interviews with these people, but alas they are missing. It is not because no effort was made to obtain such knowledge, because I learned from Palmer that the owner was dead and that his wife still owned the property. From this it would also seem that the date of the Ferrie occupancy presented no problem to a determined professional investigator. Moreover, because of the manner in which the city directories in New Orleans are prepared, once every two years, with a single address, that of occupancy at the time of inquiry being the only one given, is it not unusual that no city directory address for the Ferrie's is given -- or that their absence from the directory is noted? Is it not strange too that there is no notation here of consultation with the phone books, which would disclose whether or not they had phones, or that the phone company records were not consulted to determine not only whether they had phones, but the addresses at which the phones might have been listed?

Because I was troubled by this glaring void in the seemingly thorough and authoritative memo, which achieves an impressive tone with the inclusion of all the unnecessary triviality that is not essential and the omission of all the obvious that is and should have been readily available, and because the capitalization of the "S" in "Sister's", which is in the typed version of the memo as well as the printed one of the Commission, I consulted Barbara Reid about this. Here let me note that for the editor in Washington, as well as the court reporter in Washington, to have known that Nancy was referring to the ownership of this property by the Mother Cabrini sisters without check is entirely unlikely. Somebody in Washington had to have had this knowledge, therefore, a search in the archives was in order. It could have been done by Bethell or Boxley by phone.

Here I digress to note that

any effort, even the minimal, was made to learn her identity, if she ever existed. This quatation is pivotal. Everything in the entire structure being built depends upon it. Failure to identify the"unknown woman tenant", of any effort to learn her identity, makes the suspicion she either does not exist or would be destructive to the prefabrication an unavoidable possibility. No less suspect is the elimination from the summary memorandum for Garrison of the known dubious character of the "reverend" landlord when it was known and is recorded elsewhere.

The man ultimately is said to have moved in. K is said never to have seen him "but on at least two occasions he - KRUSCHEVSKI - 'broke into' the apartment in an effort to collect rent from the man." Pretty good. He doesn't know who owes him money, has no records, and breaks in when the man obviously is not there to collect rent from the missing man. If he saw anything but "radio equipment", described as "several sets of", that is not recorded. Nor is it that, having seen this equipment of imputed value, he did not hold it hostage for his money. For what other purpose could he have broken in? Even the idea that this was radio equipment seems to have been planted in K's mind, from the other Memorandum. On this and related aspects that memo is both interesting and in contradiction with this summary for Garrison by Boxley:

= "Mr. K says that he went over several times (not - not that he broke in) to confront the man whom he says he was not known to him by name and to collect the rent (confrontation for any other purpose?) . Mr. K says that he 'wrote several times to Mr. Walker (an obvious slip)' to demand the rent. He finally served an eviction notice on this unknown gentleman and forced him to move". Boxley and Palmer are not excessively shrewd in noting parenthetically "(an obvious slip)" and they are not excessively diligent in not having traced out Walker through the various available sources or through the court record of the alleged eviction notice. Should more comment on this be necessary? This, like the rest, is not traced by the most elementary police methods for a reason that would seem to be apparent: it would end the fabricated case that is entirely without substance.

The bit on the "radio equipment": "Mr. K. stated that he thought the man was an engineer because he had equipment in the apartment. When we inquired as to whether it was radio equipment, Mr. K. answered affirmatively."

Did they first ask him if there were transits or levels or any other kind of engineering "equipment"? There is no suggestion of this. Any metering or measuring equipment of any kind? No, only "radio", and "several sets", which is consistent with theplanting of the notion that this was communication equipment for assassins, something not said but certaintly intended to be concluded. Why else was he asked about only radio equipment?

What, by this time, could be more credible that these two excerpts from the

the sentence: "...KHRUSCHEVSKI stated that he had not seen the man" and "he said the man was 'about fifty-five years old'." Is it necessary to say that if Khruschevski did not know the name of the man he knew was named Walker, he had to have had some way of knowing the alleged age? If he had not seen him, as he did not know his name, he certainly must have known someone who had seen him. The indication of any quest for this person is totally nonexistent.

Fortuitously, the unnamed Walker "finally disappeared" at the same time as PERRIN's death and within a week after MRS PERRIN's departure from the apartment, which was on August 28-30, 1962."

With the known relationship between the death and the departure, the emphasis added is unnecessary, a literary device that is here a propaganda device. But the glaring lack of even the most cursory search for the unnamed named or the named Walker, and no matter how rudimentary check on the very obvious sources, is ample indication no fact was wanted. It would be interesting to have ordinary police do what was not done here, not intelligence agents of super skills. Where this was done, the results are spectacular - and 100% opposite to the statements of Boxley's reports, as we shall see.

With this construction, we are left to assume that there was a connection between Nancy in 1713 and nameless Walker in 1715 (earlier described as "the apartment across the hall from the PERRIN residence") ~~Language that seems to require explanation~~).

K is quoted as having volunteered that "the woman in Mayor Morrison's office" and here, in parens, Boxley adds"(Presumeably Mrs. Grad)"- only he said "Grubb" and Jim corrected it to Grad) "once tried to rent an apartment from me for GUY BANISTER". This is a real wierdo and more bait for Jim. Banister and Morrison were, political, antipodal. It is scarecely possible to bracket two prominent men in New Orleans who were more politically opposite each other, with less in common, or anything less likely that Mrs. Grad, whose name brought other things to Jim's mind, having any interest in Banister for Morrison or any other reason. Her husband's printing shop, Jim notes, "was adjacent to Carlos Bringuier's". It was actually a closer relationship. Bringuier rented from Grad the front of the building in which Grad had his shop.

stet

The Kittess story that here follows is worth much more analysis that there is now time for. It, too, is carefully contrived, with the same missing pieces not sought, the same absence of testing, etc. Perhaps, because of the crucial importance of the introducing of the picture and the identification of the " walking man", read Bradley, by Boxley, if I restrict myself to that aspect it can be regarded as a fair sample.

Introducing Bradley at the time Jim was having serious legal reverses about him in California was obviously designed to have special appeal for him, for there is no one at all close to him who does not know how bitter Jim was about this.

Without any preliminaries, this appears near the middle of page 9:

On September 27, 1968 (underlining in original, beginning with S only) MASON AND DIANNE KITTESS were shown the photograph of "The Walking Man" and "Frenchy" taken in Dealey Plaza November 22, 1963".

I asked Joel Palmer about this. Why, I wanted to know, was a picture Jim was convinced was of Bradley shown to these people. His reply was because it was suggested by the description previously given of this "55-year-old" man. If this is the case, and I have no reason to believe it was, there is no suggestion of any kind of a description of this man, not from anyone. That picture seems to be of a man less than 55, with blond hair. In any event, the Kittesses were shown these six described pictures and no other, in Bexley's words, as though they had meaning, "simultaneously".

It should be born in mind that this was afterwards, 38 days later. Lawrence Howard, Bill Seymour, Jack Starr(two) and Perrin (also two). Later a picture of Loran Hall was said to have been added. Seymour was with a beard and mussed hair, the others are dark and connected with another story not known to have spent any time in New Orleans. In any event, there is no similarity between them and Perrin or Starr, who Bexley claims was substituted for Perrin. This selection is contrived to make Starr-Perrin identification automatic.

If this is dubious, designed to elicit predetermined response and undependable "identification", what can be said of what was done 38 days earlier, on what from the name was the first meeting with the Kittesses, when they were shown a picture of "The Walking Man" alone - meaning Bradley, as far as Jim and Bexley are concerned? There is no explanation from Bexley and Palmer's is palpably false. There was no other picture used on this occasion. I made a 11:44 mistake in going into this with Palmer, and he did not correct me. I said that including "The Walking man" with Hall-Howard-Seymour (and I mentioned no others) made his selection automatic. Palmer merely smiled.

When, thereafter, on November 4, the Kittesses were again shown the Walking Man picture, naturally they identified him again. "Positive and forceful" are the words Bexley uses to describe their "identification". Once he had gotten them to commit themselves again, "Both then were shown the M.O.Cormner's Office photo #2627 and asked if it looked like the dead man who occupied 1713 Calhoun. Neither witness said that it did".

Previously, Dianne Kittess had identified a picture of Perrin as "resembling" the man who died, who Bexley wants not to be considered to have been Perrin. What he dared not omit is this: "Both agreed they had never seen the deceased closely enough to remember him." So, withall, no identification was at all dependable.

This type of photographic manipulation should require no further comment.

But it did not end there. "On Saturday, November 9, 1968, the KITTESS family...

...were shown the portrait photograph...of EDGAR EUGENE BRADLEY..." With this Precondition, the Kittesses, quite naturally made "positive" identification of him as the man from overhead. And did they add detail!

There is more, but is it needed?

Because of time requirement, I skip now to the Boxley 10-1-68 memo "Identification of Robert Lee Perrin". This is designed to cast doubt on the identification of Perrin as the dead man. If, as I would hope is not the case, it requires further analysis, it can be provided later.

All of these things have been building up to the 11-22-68 (what a vengeful force selected this date!) memo "Arsenic death of ROBERT LEE PERRIN, August 28, 1962". It has the same purpose. It is the vital "proof" that someone else was murdered, not Perrin (without support of any kind, Palmer told me it was a "seaman"). It would seem that the entire contrived case immediately falls apart when what was obvious and should have been done - and wasn't - was, belatedly, done. Boxley says the call, from whoever, to the State police, was at 1:35 a.m. (deviously he seeks to place it even earlier). Then he says, "The Coroner's Office Day Record Item 14040 states the victim was received at Charity Hospital at 4:15 a.m. and died at 6:05 a.m. WHY DID IT REQUIRE APPROXIMATELY TWO HOURS AND FORTY-FIVE MINUTES to get the victim to the hospital?"

I am confident this question impressed him very much when he read it. With the careful assembling of non-information, misinformation and distortion, by the time he got this he was ready to accept anything, as perhaps most busy men dependant upon trusted subordinates would have been.

The rest of the memo is of similar poison, so I restrict myself to this. I do note, however, no indication that the morgue record book was consulted and studied.

Two days after Jince and I got here, Frank Meloche was sent to consult the records of Charity Hospital. They disclose that what Boxley said is false and explain why he did not consult the only original source. The ambulance carrying Perrin reached the hospital at 2:45 a.m., a seemingly not unreasonable time when it is considered that the wrong police were called, they then called the right police, they got an ambulance, things were done at the scene, etc. The 4:15 time Boxley misquites is the time emergency treatment was ended in the emergency room and Perrin was transferred to the ward.

Had the morgue book been consulted (Boxley's memos contain no such reference, but Palmer assures me Boxley told him it had been), it would become immediately apparent that this page and every item on it was in order. Perrin is listed as number 2627. There are no skipped lines, no erasures, no changes, and a number of us inspected the book when Jesse Ivon personally got it the same day. He says the officials say there has been no previous inspection of this. If Palmer is right, Boxley would seem to have perpetrated a deliberate fraud on Garrison and perhaps

had it not been stopped, on history. If Palmer is wrong and the morgue officials are right, he deliberately avoided the required investigation that would have destroyed the fraudulent case he had carefully contrived and foisted off on the trusting Garrison.

There are many other dubious aspects of this file. Things said to be in it are not. Other witnesses are similarly undependable, leady twisted, etc. I would think that at this point no more is necessary. I emphasize this is a nasty analysis, with no opportunity for acareful reading of the file and that under adverse circumstances. There has not been time for a rereading or the making of notes or the outlining of this commentary. I suggest that if this is immediately apparent to me, a really careful analysis would be much more overwhelming.

In passing, I want to note that while a great deal hangs on the story given Boxley by a Mrs. Teissier, there is, consistently, no appraisal of her reliability and judgement. It nonetheless may have inadvertently provided by her opinion of Perrin. He "must have been an educated man"..."because (he had said) this is my King Arthur table..."

The second memo quoted from, that on the autopsy, etc., makes a major point of the absence of this and all other similar records for the year 1962. I have no knowledge of this, but on reading it I was reminded of something David Chandler had told me a month ago, that he was doing a story on unsolved deaths. While I was with him the chief of police phoned him to let him know the files were ready for his examination. I phoned David. He told me that these old files are all stored rather haphazardly in a basement area. He checked to see if he has this one. He does not. But in any event, it seems as though there is nothing unusual in the absence of all the file for this year, because they are automatically moved into a storage area. It would seem not to be beyond the capacity of a skilled intelligence agent to learn and report the normal distribution of old files.

Because Barbara had early flagged my interest in what Boxley and Palmer were doing, and because the reactions of each of them galvanized my attention, I made it a point to look up Joel Palmer. First I phoned him before lunch on Friday and began talking to him. Here I learned they had not made the slightest effort to give the straight information on the St. Philip (correct spelling) St. residences. They did know the owner of 637, told me the man who then had owned the building was dead and it was now owned by his wife. Clearly, not the Sisters. Therefore, aside from those other ignored addresses, this means there is a damaging history of Nancy and probably Perrin in New Orleans they have deliberately left out. The obvious reason is that it would be inconsistent with the case they were building out of nothing.

In the course of this conversation, Joel made hints about the importance of Nancy in the story of the JFK assassination. I asked him what it was. He asked if I wanted it in two or three words. I said in whatever form he preferred . When he indi-

[redacted]ated a reluctance to speak over the phone I immediately made a date to go to his home. Without telling him in advance, I took Bud Fensterwald with me.

I spoke to Joel frankly, telling him he lies and in no way hiding my purposes. He seemed uneasy, and I said I was not accusing him of being an agent. I also pointed out that busy and harrassed as Jim Garrison was, he did not have time to make his own, independent analyses, did not have time to examine every word of every memo, and, in effect, could become the creature of those he trusted. I asked him the rhetorical question, what would happen to Garrison if he was fed and used bad information that was very bad. Joel agreed it would ruin everything. I said I had not made the investiment of time and money, suffered the sacrifices I have for anything like that to happen, and that I was, therefore, also deeply concerned for Garrison's security. We then proceeded.

I began by expressing the preference for taping what we said, saying I'd not be able to recall all of it, and I did not want the risk of inaccurate recall. I also told him that I would be saying things of which I thought he should have a record and I encouraged him to tape it, too. He said he prefered that I not tape, and I didn't, and he did not himself, at least not visibly.

In essence, there is no case. He and Boxley have been making this up as they go. He had no satisfactory answer to a single thing I asked or said. As we left, Bud said he had never seen a man so shredded. Of course, it was all quite and polite. I took most of the so-called fact of the memos and bit by bit he acknowledged they were wrong or incomplete or untested. The story they were contriving, in essence, is this:

It is not Perrin but a sailor who was killed. Perrin went to Dallas and was part of the assassination, he did not specify what part. Prior to this it had been the plan to do the job at the dedication of the Nashville Ave. Wharf, a perfect contrivance for the Shaw case (Russo's testimony). I asked why there and he said, "It is a second Dealey Plaza" (a year and a half ahead of time.). He explained that after going under the bridge, the motorcade could not turn around. He also insisted that escape would be easy. This point was preferable to such obvious alternatives as the railroad tracks along Airline Highway.

Perrin was an excellent shot and an assassin. He apparently became Starr once he was dead. Nancy was, without doubt, an accomplice or an accessory in his murder. I asked for the evidence and the answer was it had to be. I said she had a perfect alibi whoever she was sleeping with at Baton Rouge, and he corrected me to Westwego, which he said was about 5 miles away (I understand it is really more correct quite close). He was entirely unable to produce any suggestion of how she could possibly be involved on the evidence they had and unbending on his insistence it was as they said and that she should be charged by Jim.

I asked him why Boxley had called me off when I was interested and wanted to buy

tatoos but insist one on an arm was missing in this description.
He insists Boxley told him he had checked the morgue book, that the autopsy was attached to the file (and the 23 letters of the mother's also are in it).

In the non-explanation I got, this was a murder for no reason, without any profit, by people who had nothing in it, and regardless of where she was, how far away or otherwise occupied, Nancy was in on her husband's murder. It just had to be that way, and if there was no evidence, no crediting any of it, if none of it was in any way solid, it still had to be that way.

He acknowledged I was one of the few who had been interested in Nancy's story from the first, had written of her, and had continued that interest. He acknowledged having interested me in the Jack Youngblood possibility and that at the very least it had to be checked out - and wasn't.

Although he had originally told me he was doing a book on Banister, forgetting this he told me his book was on the "probe". When I pointed out the discrepancy, he pretended it was enough to say there would be mention of Banister in it.

He still does not have the Alyea film for me, this time because it is in a box somewhere in California, with his stuff.

Originally he was doing a story. Then he was doing a book, as I understand it, to be done in 4-6 weeks. Having been in New Orleans several months, he now says he has moved his residence here. He lacks visible means of support. The top price Confidential pays is $200. With an occasional repeat in another of the same house's properties, the yield per story is small. His travel expenses on that story, those of which I know on a single trip, consumed that and more. If he got what is, for today, a good advance, it was gone before he got to work here and lacks visible means of supporting himself in this new city and on a very decent level, from the norms of this kind of writing.

He agreed it was odd for Boxley to be turning me off when I was in town and made inquiries, yet when I was available he used Turner as a corroborating witness, and the report of that interview has disproportionate length on that. He acknowledged Turner served no special purpose, that he knew of no knowledge of this aspect Turner had, and that he did know I did have knowledge. He acknowledge this did make it seem that Boxley was trading on Turner's name and feared having me with him and in a position to see what was going on. I told him of the letter I had written Boxley and why, and that I'd had no response.

These additional things from the few handwritten notes I was able to make:

Joel said that as his last information Jack Youngblood of the book was at Rancho Santa Rosa, Ashdown, Ark. He thinks he is still there. It is obvious that ascertaining whether he was the Youngblood of the Nancy testimony would have been a simple matter.

Youngblood is not mentioned in Nancy's depositions. From this it seems the government had no reason to suspect she would use his name. He is satisfied the Dallas Youngblood is the right one, for no other reason that he offered.

His phone conversation with Nancy was 9-16-66. Her new husband is named Hamilton. He raises (races?) horses. Rich told him that Nancy was a government agent. He acknowledges Rich's probable source was Nancy. I asked him what her function could be and he said baby sitter. I asked for whom? Perrin. For what? Apparently for the assassination so far in the future.

The FBI got and kept all the medical records whether not disposed of (originals, that is).

They attribute significance to what they regard as the delay in signing the autopsy report. However, he acknowledges this seems to have been done within two days and that the lab work is included in it.

I got no meaningful explanation of the German calls that seem to figure so importantly in their case and Jim's thinking.

The Brenner telegram was from Manuel Santos 1-3-61. Joel said it was a boy of Pico after. Brenner says he knows nothing about this. It did originate in Dallas. These may not have the obvious meaning: Child- no record in Dallas but in N.O.; No checking on flights.

Placing her in Texas time of assassination.

"Evidence" she had an abortion here, too.

Several something ending "atique" including after or on 1-64.

Hamilton has army, foreign duty husband was sick't.

Agreed pictures point to walking man only.